

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/330,016	06/11/1999	HIROSHI YAMAZAKI	1185.1047/JD	8878	
21171	7590 12/29/2003		EXAM	EXAMINER	
STAAS & HALSEY LLP			NGUYEN, DUNG T		
SUITE 700 1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20005			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2871		
			DATE MAILED: 12/29/200	DATE MAILED: 12/29/2003	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)	
_	Advisory Action	09/330,016	YAMAZAKI ET AL.	
4.	Advicery Action	Examiner	Art Unit	<u> </u>
		Dung Nguyen	2871	Au
	-The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	orrespondence addre	ess
Therefore final rejection	LY FILED 16 December 2003 FAILS TO PLACE, further action by the applicant is required to a cition under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appelion (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this applion in a timely filed amendment which all (with appeal fee); or (3) a time	cation. A proper replich places the application	ly to a ation in
_		EPLY [check either a) or b)]		
b)	The period for reply expires 6 months from the mailing date of the period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advevent, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the DNLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). The ons of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date does not be date for purposes of determining the period of extent of the calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three most term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	visory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE te on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 sion and the corresponding amount of the statutory period for reply originally set in	f the final rejection. E FINAL REJECTION. Se 136(a) and the appropriate e fee. The appropriate exte the final Office action; or (3	ee MPEP extension fee ension fee under 2) as set forth in
37	Notice of Appeal was filed on <u>04 December 2003</u> CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF e proposed amendment(s) will not be entered b	R 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal		t forth in
			(acc NOTE below).	
` ' _	they raise new issues that would require furth		(see NOTE below);	
` _	they raise the issue of new matter (see Note I	•	enially raduaing or si	implifying the
(c) \Box	issues for appeal; and/or			
(d) 🗌	they present additional claims without cancel NOTE:	ling a corresponding number of	finally rejected claim	IS.
	plicant's reply has overcome the following rejec	· /		
	wly proposed or amended claim(s) would nceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a s	separate, timely filed	amendment
	e a)☐ affidavit, b)☐ exhibit, or c)⊠ request fo plication in condition for allowance because: <u>Se</u>		sidered but does NO	T place the
	e affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be sed by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which wer	e newly
	purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendmen			and an
The	e status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Cla	aim(s) allowed:			
Cla	aim(s) objected to:			
Cla	aim(s) rejected: <u>1-9</u> .			
Cla	aim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. The	e drawing correction filed on is a) app	proved or b) disapproved by	the Examiner.	
	te the attached Information Disclosure Stateme her:	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s).	tulue	
			Dung Nguyen Patent Examiner Art Unit: 2871	

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 11-03) Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the device claims 1-9 do not define over the art of record. Applicants' amendment and response have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

^